

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is being provided in response to the October 30, 2003 Office Action for the above-referenced application. In this response, Applicant has added new Claims 93-100 and amended Claims 51, 52, 67, 68, 72, 73, 88, and 89 in order to clarify that which Applicant deems to be the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the newly added claims and the amendments to the claims are all supported by the originally filed application.

The rejection of Claims 67, 68, 88 and 89 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 has been addressed by Claim amendments provided herein in accordance with the guidelines provided in the Office Action. In particular, Applicant has amended Claims 67 and 88 to recite searching for instances of specified text in said at least one report selected. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 51-61, 63-67, 69-82, 84-88 and 90-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Draper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,924,096, hereinafter referred to as "Draper") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 51-61, 63-67, 69-82, 84-88 and 90-92, as amended herein, are patentable over the cited reference.

Applicant notes that although the Office Action at page 3 states that Claims 67 and 88 are rejected as being anticipated by Draper, the Office Action does not appear to provide support or a basis for the rejection of these claims with a corresponding citation to a portion of Draper. For reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 67 and 88 each respectively depend from independent claims which are patentable over Draper.

Claim 51, as amended herein, recites a method of viewing a visual form of data associated with tags comprising: selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data; opening the database; issuing a query to the database; providing a list of reports including the visual form of the data and associated tags corresponding to the query; selecting at least one report from the list; constructing a named temporary file for each metafile corresponding to the at least one report selected; and executing a previewer program which accesses a control file to view said visual form of the data represented by metafile data included in said named temporary file. Claims 52-61, 63-67, and 69-71 depend from Claim 51.

Claim 72, as amended herein, recites a computer program product for viewing a visual form of data associated with tags comprising: machine executable code for selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data; machine executable code for opening the database; machine executable code for issuing a query to the database; machine executable code for providing a list of reports including the visual form of the data and associated tags corresponding to the query; machine executable code for selecting at least one report from the list; machine executable code for constructing a named temporary file for each metafile corresponding to the at least one report selected; and machine executable code for executing a previewer program which accesses a control file to view said visual form of the

data represented by metafile data included in said named temporary file. Claims 73-82, 84-88, and 90-92 depend from Claim 72.

Draper relates to distributed database computer systems, and more particularly to distributed database system which used indexed tags to track events according to type, to update a cache database of database data items, to construct an update log on demand and to provide other capabilities. (Col. 1, Lines 8-12). Draper's Figure 2 includes a data index 200 and a set of data items 202. Each data item 202 has an associated tag 204. The data items 202 may include objects, records or other collections of data values. Each tag 204 value corresponds to an event in the history of the associated data item 202, such as the most recent update to the data item 202. Tags 204 are typically restricted to internal use. Suitable tags 204 includes timestamps, version numbers, sequence numbers, update reference numbers, transaction counters, and other means of determining the relative order of operations on the data items 202. A transaction counter guarantees ordering of events and supports synchronization because the counter is received by a cache or other database copy from master database copy. (Col. 5, Lines 3-37).

Claim 51, as amended herein, is neither disclosed nor suggested by Draper in that Draper neither discloses nor suggests *a method of viewing a visual form of data associated with tags comprising: selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data; opening the database; issuing a query to the database; providing a list of reports including the visual form of the data and associated tags corresponding to the query; selecting at least one report from the list; constructing a named*

temporary file for each metafile corresponding to the at least one report selected; and executing a previewer program which accesses a control file to view said visual form of the data represented by metafile data included in said named temporary file, as set forth in Claim 51. Draper discloses data items with associated tags used to determine the relative order of operations on data items. Draper discloses that data items may include object, records or other collections of data values but appears silent regarding any disclosure of a visual form of data corresponding to a print form of the data, or a display form of the data. Draper discloses tags used to determine the relative order of operations on data items, but Draper appears silent regarding any disclosure of tags associated with the visual form of the data. Accordingly, Draper neither discloses nor suggests at least the feature of *selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data*, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 51.

For reasons similar to Claim 51, Applicant's Claim 72, as amended herein, is also neither disclosed nor suggested by Draper in that Draper neither discloses nor suggests *a computer program product for viewing a visual form of data associated with tags comprising: machine executable code for selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data; machine executable code for opening the database; machine executable code for issuing a query to the database; machine executable code for providing a list of reports including the visual form of the data and associated tags corresponding to the*

query; machine executable code for selecting at least one report from the list; machine executable code for constructing a named temporary file for each metafile corresponding to the at least one report selected; and machine executable code for executing a previewer program which accesses a control file to view said visual form of the data represented by metafile data included in said named temporary file, as set forth in Claim 72.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 62 and 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper in view of Vachey (U.S. Patent No. 5,630,120, hereinafter referred to as “Vachey”) is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 62 and 83 are patentable over the cited references, taken separately or in combination.

Claim 62 depends from independent Claim 51. Claim 83 depends from independent Claim 72. For reasons set forth above, Applicant’s Claims 51 and 72 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Draper. For reasons set forth below, Applicant also respectfully submits that combining Draper with Vachey also neither discloses nor suggests Claims 51 and 72, and claims that depend therefrom.

Claims 51 and 72 are summarized above.

Vachey relates to a method to help in optimizing a query from a relational data base management system. The method includes constructing a tree on the basis of the search for the execution plan of the query written in the RDBMS query language. The tree is representative of the execution plan of the query and the tree is represented on the screen. (See Abstract; Col. 1, Lines 21-24; Col. 3, Lines 11-18). Figure 2B of Vachey illustrates a query menu of a log-on screen including a scrolling list 21. (Col. 5, Lines 34-35).

Claim 51 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest *a method of viewing a visual form of data associated with tags comprising: selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data; opening the database; issuing a query to the database; providing a list of reports including the visual form of the data and associated tags corresponding to the query; selecting at least one report from the list; constructing a named temporary file for each metafile corresponding to the at least one report selected; and executing a previewer program which accesses a control file to view said visual form of the data represented by metafile data included in said named temporary file*, as set forth in Claim 51. For reasons set forth above, Draper neither discloses nor suggests at least the feature of *selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data*, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 51. Vachey also appears silent regarding any disclosure or suggestion of a report including a visual form of data and a tag associate with the

visual form of the data. Thus, Vachy does not overcome the deficiencies of Draper with respect to Applicant's amended Claim 51. Accordingly, the references do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the feature of *selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data*, as set forth in Applicant's amended Claim 51.

For reasons similar to those set forth regarding Claim 51, Applicant's Claim 72, as amended herein, is also neither disclosed nor suggested by the references, taken separately or in combination, in that the references neither disclose nor suggest *a computer program product for viewing a visual form of data associated with tags comprising: machine executable code for selecting a database containing a plurality of reports wherein each report includes a visual form of the data corresponding to one of a print form of the data or a display form of the data and associated tags, wherein at least one of said tags is associated with the visual form of the data; machine executable code for opening the database; machine executable code for issuing a query to the database; machine executable code for providing a list of reports including the visual form of the data and associated tags corresponding to the query; machine executable code for selecting at least one report from the list; machine executable code for constructing a named temporary file for each metafile corresponding to the at least one report selected; and machine executable code for executing a previewer program which accesses a control file to view said visual form of the data represented by metafile data included in said named temporary file*, as set forth in Claim 72.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that newly added Claims 93-100 are also patentable over the cited prior art.

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 617-248-4042.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART



Anne E. Saturnelli
Registration No. 41,290

Date: April 30, 2004

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-2804
Tel: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 248-4000